



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
06/B04197	12/03/85	VIRTANEN	R P418-566-KBS

ARMSTRONG, NIKAIID, MARCELSTEIN &
KUBOVCIK
1725 K ST., N. W., STE. 912
WASHINGTON, DC 20006

EXAMINER	
FRIEDMAN, S	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
125	
DATE MAILED 12/11/86	

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

12/11/86

☒ This application has been examined ☐ Responsive to communication filed on _____ ☐ This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), 0 days from the date of this letter.
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

- ☒ Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892.
- ☐ Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948.
- ☐ Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449
- ☐ Notice of informal Patent Application, Form PTO-152
- ☐ Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474
- ☐ _____

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

- ☒ Claims 1-4 are pending in the application.
Of the above, claims _____ are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claims _____ have been cancelled.
- ☐ Claims _____ are allowed.
- ☒ Claims 1-4 are rejected.
- ☐ Claims _____ are objected to.
- ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.
- ☐ This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes until such time as allowable subject matter is indicated.
- ☐ Allowable subject matter having been indicated, formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.
- ☐ The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on _____. These drawings are ☐ acceptable; ☐ not acceptable (see explanation).
- ☐ The ☐ proposed drawing correction and/or the ☐ proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on _____ has (have) been ☐ approved by the examiner. ☐ disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed _____, has been ☐ approved. ☐ disapproved (see explanation). However, the Patent and Trademark Office no longer makes drawing changes. It is now applicant's responsibility to ensure that the drawings are corrected. Corrections **MUST** be effected in accordance with the instructions set forth on the attached letter "INFORMATION ON HOW EFFECT DRAWING CHANGES", PTO-1474.
- ☒ Acknowledgment is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has ☐ been received ☐ not been received
☐ been filed in parent application, serial no. _____; filed on _____
- ☐ Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
- ☐ Other

Serial No. 804,197

-2-

Art Unit 125

Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as the disclosure is enabling only for claims limited in accord with page 1, line 25. See MPEP 706.03(n) and 706.03(z). "Administering" is broader than i.m. and i.v.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) and (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over the admitted facts of page 1. It would be expected that a sedative/analgesic would have activity in any animal. It is also noted that "mammal" broadly stated in claim 1 clearly includes any prior art animal.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be

Serial No. 804,197
Art. Unit 125

-3-

patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) and (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Chem. Abst. The compounds is taught as therapeutically old. The open form of the host is readable on the intended host for the prior art use. Accordingly, the claims are not patentable, the specific use notwithstanding.


The formula of page 1 appears in error.

Friedman:pw

A/C 703

557-3920

2/6/86



Stanley J. Friedman
Primary Examiner
Group Art Unit 125